



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/701,551

11/06/2003

Young-Hoon Kim

1349.1316

8321

21171 7590 11/26/2008
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

WILLS, LAWRENCE E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed October 30, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that "The teachings of Sugawara and Harrison does not suggest "a post-processing operation adding unit to add an e-mail post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent;...and a post-processing operation implementing unit to check whether there is an e-mail post processing operation designated in the received e-mail and to implement the post-processing operation to perform post-processing of the e-mail as designated," as recited in independent claim 1." (Remarks, page 9), the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Sugawara teaches in Fig. 3, the sending an e-mail message that is generated with header that allows for the addition of message disposition notification (MDN) (S3-4 or S3-6). The result of the MDN can be seen in Fig. 7, which shows a transmission result report. Therefore, Sugawara does teach a post-processing operation adding unit to add an e-mail operation (MDN) to the e-mail to be sent. Sugawara also teaches in Fig. 4 receiving an e-mail message with (or without) the MDN header and determining whether or not there the received mail has the MDN header (S4-4) Therefore, Sugawara does teach to check whether there is an e-mail post processing operation designated in the received e-mail.

Harrison teaches appending to the mail any activities the Agent/rules have taken on the user's behalf. The appending of the e-mail is viewed as adding an e-mail post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent and to implement the post-processing operation to perform post-processing of the e-mail as designated

In combination Sugawara in view of Harrison teaches a post-processing operation adding unit to add an e-mail post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent;...and a post-processing operation implementing unit to check whether there is an e-mail post processing operation designated in the received e-mail and to implement the post-processing operation to perform post-processing of the e-mail as designated.

Arguments regarding claim 8, 12, (page 9), 19 (page 9 and 10), 20, 21, and 22 (page 10) have also been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the same reasons as claim 1.